

STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Hearing Date: April 18, 2008

Subject Matter of Proposed Regulations: Qualification of Applicant.

Section Affected: 1937

Specific Purpose of each adoption, amendment, or repeal

Amend Section 1937 to require that branch 2 and/or 3 field representative and operator applicants gain training and experience in structural Integrated Pest Management as part of their pre-licensing requirements.

Factual Basis/Rationale

To address concerns about water quality and pesticide runoff, the Structural Pest Control Board formed the Water Quality Committee. To address these concerns, the committee has recommended that Integrated Pest Management (IPM) practices be included in the pre-licensing training and experience for branch 2 and/or 3 applicants.

Underlying Data

None

Business Impact

The Board has initially determined there will be no significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses.

Specific Technologies or Equipment

This regulation does not mandate the use of specific technologies or equipment.

Consideration of Alternatives

No reasonable alternative to the regulation would be either more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation.

STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Hearing Date: April 18, 2008

Subject Matter of Proposed Regulations: Continuing Education Requirements.

Section Affected: 1950

Specific Purpose of each adoption, amendment, or repeal:

Amend Section 1950 to require that branch 2 and/or 3 licensees gain continuing education hours in structural Integrated Pest Management as part of their license renewal requirements.

Factual Basis/Rationale

To address the concerns of water quality and pesticide runoff, the Water Quality Committee has recommended that Integrated Pest Management (IPM) be included in the hours required for the renewal of branch 2 and/or 3 licenses.

Underlying Data

None

Business Impact

This regulation will not have a significant adverse economic impact on businesses.

Specific Technologies or Equipment

This regulation does not mandate the use of specific technologies or equipment.

Consideration of Alternatives

No reasonable alternative to the regulation would be either more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation.

STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Hearing Date: April 18, 2008

Subject Matter of Proposed Regulations: Hour Value System

Section Affected: 1950.5

Specific Purpose of each adoption, amendment, or repeal

Amend Section 1950.5 to establish an hour value for board approved Integrated Pest Management courses.

Factual Basis/Rationale

The proposed inclusion of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in the renewal requirements for branch 2 and/or 3 licenses requires that an hour value be established for Board approved IPM courses.

Underlying Data

None

Business Impact

The Board has initially determined there will be no significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses.

Specific Technologies or Equipment

This regulation does not mandate the use of specific technologies or equipment.

Consideration of Alternatives

No reasonable alternative to the regulation would be either more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation.

STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Hearing Date: April 18, 2008

Subject Matter of Proposed Regulations: Approval of Activities

Section Affected: 1953

Specific Purpose of each adoption, amendment, or repeal

Repeal Section 1953(f)(3)(D) to remove the requirement that continuing education course providers provide course evaluation forms to students.

Factual Basis/Rationale

Board staff collected statistics over a six-month period examining the percentage of students who submitted the course evaluation forms to the Board. Approximately 2 % of students submitted the forms during this period. Citing this statistic and that Board staff cannot enforce student compliance, the subsection should be repealed.

Underlying Data

None

Business Impact

The Board has initially determined there will be no significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses.

Specific Technologies or Equipment

This regulation does not mandate the use of specific technologies or equipment.

Consideration of Alternatives

No reasonable alternative to the regulation would be either more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation.